

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
DECEMBER 10, 2019

Commission Chair Ted Knowlton called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Commission Chair Ted Knowlton  
Commissioner Stephen Garn  
Commissioner Kent Kirkham  
Commissioner William Ward  
Commissioner Brandon Tucker  
Commissioner BreAnna Larson  
Commissioner Natalie Gordon

STAFF PRESENT: Sherrie Llewelyn, Community Development Director; Kate Werrett, Planner; Andrea Bradford, Minutes Secretary.

OTHERS PRESENT: Scott Betts, Jordan Betts, Dee Lalliss, residents; Megan Townsend, Wasatch Front Regional Council.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

2. WORK SESSION-REVIEW DRAFT FORM BASED CODE WITH CONSULTANT

Sherrie Llewelyn said that Megan Townsend with Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) was present to help with the revisions to the form based code.

Chair Knowlton asked for an update on the status of the previous revisions to the draft code. Kate Werrett reported that she compiled the notes she had received from the Planning Commissioners and had given it to Megan to incorporate into the draft. She said all the revisions would be made before it was presented to the City Council.

Chair Knowlton said the form based code was well thought out and everything was clear while still giving an applicant the opportunity to do what they wanted. He said this was a good starting point for the process as it saved the applicant time and gave the City comprehensive code backing.

Commissioner Kirkham said it was helpful for staff to have a base as well.

Sherrie Llewelyn asked Megan Townsend for guidance on language in Section 5 Buildings related to materials and colors. This section states that the “Main building colors shall utilize any historic palettes from any major paint manufacturer.” Megan Townsend commented that “historic palettes” was very vague and that there may be a better way to clarify what would be allowed including the addition of approved color swatches or detailing what was not permitted.

Sherrie Llewelyn suggested no fluorescent or bright patterns be allowed. Chair Knowlton said the objective would be the avoidance of things that would annoy or detract from the community.

Megan Townsend said if the Commission could identify the goal she could find best practices to help meet that policy.

The Commission discussed having too many textures and colors in one project, the need for complimentary palettes, limiting the number of different finishes/colors on a facade, limiting fluorescent and bright colors, no more than two accent colors, potential to include swatches in the code, that the colors should be subjective, wording to require colored architectural renderings, and when approval may be needed by the Planning Commission.

Sherrie Llewelyn then shared a presentation regarding setbacks with those present. She spoke on the suggestion that the setbacks should relate to the size of the street and a potential to review alternatives for a more uniform method. The first setback discussed was for the Core subdistrict with front and corner setbacks from the building siting with a minimum of 0 feet to a maximum of 10 feet. Additional footage would be allowed for ADA, clear views or 20 foot restaurant seating with Planning Commission approval. Mrs. Llewelyn showed a rendering of the street with a bus rapid transit line, a center median, 120 foot right of way, 7 foot sidewalk, and 8 foot park strip in comparison with a building that had a 0 foot setback, one with a 5 foot setback, and another with a 10 foot setback. The setback would be measured from the foundation wall.

Chair Knowlton asked if some of the private setback could be applied to a wider sidewalk as there were no bike lanes on Highway 89. Sherrie Llewelyn said that the draft of the active transportation plan did not provide bike lanes on Highway 89 as there were better routes parallel to the highway.

The Commission discussed the possibility of adding bike lanes by having zero setbacks and expanding the right of way along Highway 89.

Sherrie Llewelyn stated that UDOT did not want bike lanes along Highway 89 unless it was in the shoulder as shown in the active transportation plan, which would be presented to the Commission for review prior to City Council adoption.

Chair Knowlton suggested that eventually there may be substantial urban buildings and that a 10 foot setback would allow for future flexibility.

Commissioner Tucker asked what the downside to having a wider setback would be. Sherrie Llewelyn said that having a setback that was too wide could result in the loss of vibrancy and walkability.

Commissioner Gordon suggested that instead of changing the setback the sidewalk could be widened from 7 feet to 10 feet or more, which would allow for the addition of a bike lane in the future.

Commissioner Garn said if there were retail stores in this area that wider sidewalks would be beneficial for outdoor displays, benches, or table and chairs. Sherrie Llewelyn commented that that part of the issue was that the sidewalk would be public property so an allowance would have to be written into the ordinance for a sidewalk café, etc.

The Commission debated whether the setback or the sidewalk should be expanded, how to accommodate a bike lane, and what would be considered common space. The Commissioners agreed that the setback on all of the zones along Highway 89 should be 10 feet minimum with an exception of up to 15 feet based on building and street type. They also discussed the setback being landscaping or sidewalk, a requirement for an access easement, and conveying the intent for the use of the right of way/setback to be flexible.

Sherrie Llewelyn then reported on setbacks in the Edge subdistrict and said that yard buildings would have a setback of 20 feet and row buildings would have a setback of 10 to 20 feet. She showed an example of a cross section on Odell Lane that did not have a park strip but did have on street parking as well as the setbacks from a row house, townhome, and single family home.

Mrs. Llewelyn reviewed the Arts and Parks subdistrict. She said for a storefront building or stacked flats that it would be a minimum setback of 0 to a maximum of 5 feet for front siting buildings. For row buildings with flat or pitched roofs it would be a minimum of 5 feet to a maximum of 15 feet for front siting buildings. Limited bay buildings would have a setback of 0 feet to a maximum of 10 feet for front siting.

Commissioner Gordon commented on the reverse angled parking stalls proposed for this area and asked if this would be a deterrent.

Sherrie Llewelyn recommended increasing the setback from 5 feet to a minimum of 10 feet and a maximum of 15 feet. She suggested the addition of wording to allow for flexibility based on criteria to accommodate topography, ADA access, or utilities, etc. per Planning Commission approval.

Sherrie Llewelyn then asked if the Commission wanted to adjust the 0 foot setback. Several members of the Commission agreed that the 0 setback was appropriate as there would always be a park strip/buffer.

Sherrie Llewelyn spoke on the Center and Orchard subdistrict and said the setback for a storefront building and stacked flats was 0 to 5 feet for front siting, a row building would be 10 to 20 feet front siting, and a limited bay building would be 0 to 10 feet front siting. The Commission recommended changing the setbacks to a minimum of 10 feet to a maximum of 20 feet for the limited bay, stacked flats, and storefront building types on Center and Orchard Drive in this subdistrict with the townhomes on Orchard to be 15 feet to 20 feet.

Sherrie Llewelyn then reported on Boulevard subdistrict, which had the same cross section as the Core subdistrict, and North 89 subdistrict. She said staff and WFRC would come back with a revision that would make sense with the cross section.

Sherrie Llewelyn then reported on Section 7 Parking and the previously asked question of why the table did not allow shared parking with commercial and residential uses. Megan Townsend said that guest parking could be shared but the need to have guaranteed stalls for residents made this complicated. She said this was why the table for residential parking rate reductions was included in the code.

The Commission also discussed table 7.2 (2) related to shared vehicular parking as well as table 7.2 (3) for residential park rate reductions and potential changes.

Megan Townsend said the parking requirements were based on parking counts from the City compared to the industry standard. She said the percentages shown in the table were from the current City parking code.

The Commissioners determined that there should be a review of the parking ordinance citywide. They then reviewed table 7.2 (3) residential parking rate reductions and the change to clarify that it was per stall and not a percentage. They also recommended increasing the numbers shown in the table for the residential parking rate reduction in the Core subdistrict to be .15 for secure bike lockers/indoor storage, .5 for development supplied transit passes, .25 for development discounted transit passes, and .5 for senior housing for a total of .5 maximum. This adjustment would be applied to every subdistrict.

The Commission then discussed Section 4 Uses and the description of the Craftsman Industrial use. Megan Townsend explained that this use involved “small scale manufacturing, production, assembly, and/or repair with little to no noxious by-products that includes a showroom or small retail outlet. This use may also include associated facilities such as offices and small scale warehousing, but distribution is limited. The maximum overall gross floor area is limited to 20,000 square feet, unless otherwise noted.” She gave examples of this use such as a bike shop, shoe repair, coffee roaster, etc. and said it was allowed in the Core, Arts and Parks, Center and Orchard, and North 89 subdistricts.

The Commission discussed whether 20,000 square feet was too much for the Craftsman Industrial use and determined that it be reduced to 10,000 square feet maximum. Then they reviewed square footage for neighborhood retail, which was currently 12,000 square feet be reduced to 8,000 square feet maximum and general retail which was currently 12,000 square feet be 8,000 square feet or more. The Commission also determined that Craftsman Industrial be added as a permitted use in the Boulevard subdistrict.

Megan Townsend commented that she would review the square footage estimates with comparable uses in other cities.

The Commission also discussed outdoor sales lot found in the uses table 4.1 (1) and determined that as they did not want used car lots in any of these subdistricts this use would be removed from the table.

### 3. WORK SESSION-DRAFT SUBDIVISION CODE AMENDMENTS

Sherrie Llewelyn reported on current subdivision ordinances and new draft ordinances. She explained that the main goal was to organize and revise all of the current subdivision ordinances into an organized manner under a new Title 13 Subdivision Regulations. She reviewed the nine chapters of the new draft ordinance and provided a brief overview of what each chapter would contain. Mrs. Llewelyn said that some of the changes would be update the language to match State code, changes to Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) including density based on net area as well as setbacks, simplifying the section on plat amendments, and the procedure for lot line adjustments.

Sherrie Llewelyn said the next Planning Commission meeting would be January 14<sup>th</sup>. She said this meeting would include the review of these subdivision ordinance changes.

### 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The review and approval of the Planning Commission meeting minutes of November 26, 2019 were postponed until the next meeting.

5. ADJOURN

Chair Knowlton adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.



Chair



Recorder

Secretary